The Missing Dimension of Modern Education: Values Education

*Seyfi KENAN**

Abstract

Modern education today, some argue, easily integrates and adjusts to new technological developments through flexible curricula in the areas where these developments are taking place such as in the field of information technology or in the widespread use of the Internet. However, modern education can be criticized for ignoring or failing to lead societies toward a more humane future in the face of massive social and ecological changes. When it decides to encounter those social problems, the solutions that modern education procures are usually based on a fragmented or reductionist mindset that insulates them from many of the factors generating these problems and their interconnections. This article aims to examine the basic philosophical assumptions that have shaped the modern learning and educational systems and how the split between facts and values occurred. How well is modern education dealing with modern problems – the crisis of family and community, the worsening situation of civic culture and understanding, malpractice in many financial arenas of the world, global warming and dramatic ecological change across the planet, and etc.? Because the animating ideas behind the models of modern education are so strongly shaped by the influence of positivist knowledge and science, they are often inadequate where these issues are concerned because their basic assumptions regarding fundamental and ontological questions which foster students' inner worlds leave no space for the realm of values. I also more broadly discuss the pros and cons of these assumptions as they relate to and deeply influence our lives today.

Key Words

Modern Educational Philosophy, Assumptions of Modern Mindset, Mechanistic-Positivistic Worldviews, Values Education.

* *Correspondence:* Seyfi Kenan, Dr., Research Fellow, TDV İSAM & Lecturer at Marmara University, Faculty of Education Departmant of Primary Education Göztepe Kampüsü 34722 İstanbul/Turkey
E-mail: seyfi.kenan@gmail.com

Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri / Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice
9 (1) • Winter 2009 • 279-295

Many experts from a wide range of ideological backgrounds and philosophies of education believe that modern society faces serious social and moral crises, and an alarming environmental impasse never before experienced in human history (Delors, 1996; Jackson, Boostroom, & Hansen, 1998; Lickona, 1991; Noam & Wren, 1993; Wynee & Ryan, 1996). Whether we consider developed or developing countries where the scales of social and societal problems may differ, there is convincing evidence that validates this observation in many parts of the world today such as the erosion of family and community, the worsening situation of civic culture and understanding, malpractice in many financial arenas of the world, global warming and dramatic ecological change across the planet, and etc.

And if our society, whether situated in the West or East, is in a state of permanent crisis, then, it is not far-fetched to suggest, as E.F. Schumacher (1984) does, that there may be something wrong with its educational system and philosophy (p. 84). There are certain assumptions that increasingly dominate the modern mindset and shape the mainstream modern educational thinking, not only in the Western world but also in the East as well since the reigning paradigm today is based on modern assumptions. This article analyzes and critiques certain assumptions that increasingly dominate the modern mindset and shape the mainstream of modern educational thinking, not only in the Western world, but in the East which has been heavily influenced by them. I argue that we must reconsider our obeisance to science and positivism in education if we are to have any hope that we can avoid the social, political, moral, and environmental catastrophes a singular commitment to these ways of thinking practically guarantees.

The ideas of modern science and education, shaped by a hard positivism that flourished in the second half of the 19th century, spread and became influential in many countries in the world, from Europe to North America, from Brazil to Turkey. And this new turn in human understanding of the world transformed the whole debate on facts and values into a dichotomist problem (Reuben, 1996, pp. 176-221).

Modern education today, some argue, easily integrates and adjusts to new technological developments through flexible curricula in the areas where these developments are taking place, such as in the field of information technology or in the widespread use of the Internet. However, modern education can be criticized for ignoring or failing to lead so-

cieties toward a more humane future in the face of massive social and ecological change. When it decides to encounter those social problems, the solutions that modern education procures are usually based on a fragmented or reductionist mindset that insulates them from many of the factors generating these problems and their interconnections. For instance, in economically and technologically advanced countries, when the general education system realizes that poor students come to school hungry, the system may mobilize schools to provide food for their needy students. In Europe and North America today, in the wake of an alarming rate of sexually transmitted diseases among secondary and high school students and rising rates of teenage pregnancy, classes on sex education may be introduced to address these problems head-on. When aggressive, violent behaviors such as stabbings or armed attacks increase in schools, experts rush to institute better gun control and violence reduction programs in schools (Himmelfarb, 1996, p. 4).[1] When the incidences of purse snatching or pick pocketing by youth increase at alarming rates, for instance as they have in Turkey recently, authorities increase the punishment for perpetrators to remedy these problems.

There are many more examples such as these that worry responsible people across the world, but the steps taken to solve such problems are insufficient. They do not address the depths of what I believe is a socio-ethical crisis in modern education today. Not only do these piecemeal measures fail to find answers to the moral and spiritual crises facing modern education, but the model of modern education itself leaves us puzzled and perplexed with how we are to fill the vacuum of spiritual and moral values that this model has left behind. Moreover, many theorists and philosophers who take up these issues are not fully cognizant of the fact that whether or not we face an impasse in the purpose and philosophy of modern education, it only reluctantly takes on socio-ethical problems (Postman, 1996, p. 4). The ideas behind the model of modern education, shaped as they are through the influence of positivist knowledge and science, are often silent where these issues are concerned because their basic assumptions regarding fundamental and ontological issues fostering students' inner worlds leave no space for the realm of values. Science, in the perception of positivist knowledge and science, is accepted as rational and objective; values and value judgments, on the

1 Gertrude Himmelfarb, *The De-moralization of Society: From Victorian Virtues to Modern Values*, (New York; Vintage Books, 1996), p. 4.

other hand, are viewed as sensual, personal and subjective, and therefore, should be left out. Ethics and values, as Adorno succinctly says, have turned into a "saddened science" as a result of this perception (Habermas, 2003, p. 2).

Since this is the perception of modern education systems, values that are left outside the realm of science are relegated to theory, they can be analyzed and discussed as a theoretical topic or in terms of clarification, but the sense of responsibility and the commanding nature of morality must be left out since they are subjective and cannot be observed and measured by objective criterion. For this reason, modern education, fed by positivism, can tell us what truths human beings may believe in, but it does not guide in knowing what they should choose or what they should accept as good or bad or true or false in terms of moral value. This leaves us encountering the following critical questions: What kind of educational philosophy do we need? What is its basic source of legitimacy and how should fundamental social and ethical values and virtues such as justice, compassion, and generosity which make and keep civil and communal life possible be addressed? These questions challenge not only educational experts in the field but also everyone who is concerned about the education of the next generation.

If we go back in the history of thought, to the 18th century for example, we encounter one of the leading thinkers of all time, Adam Smith, considered the founding father of the modern economic system. Smith, in fact, was a professor of ethics, and a theoretician of morality rather than a theoretician of economy as we think of him today. He never reduced himself only to narrow mathematical formulations and mechanical explanations. The very first book he wrote, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments,* was the result of courses on moral philosophy he taught for a long time (Smith, 1976). Only from the fourth chapter of this book did he produce his most acclaimed book, *Wealth of Nations,* with which he pioneered the modern economic theory. The point here is that Adam Smith, the father of capitalism, believed that the solid economic foundation of any society, first of all, should be based on an authentic and well-grounded morality. But when we come to the 20th century, we observe that almost all economic analyses, explications, and justifications have rejected this idea and are reduced to mechanical and mathematical explanations devoid of moral reasoning.

How did we get to this place in our understanding of the world? Edward Gibbon, in a remarkably prescient book written nearly some 250 years ago, *Essai sur l'étude de la literature* (1761), traced the origins of what he argued was a fundamental shift in the mindset and intellectual values of modernity. He noticed that physics and mathematics had gradually been substituted for the study of *belles letters*[2] as the unrivaled form of learning and education during the previous hundred years (Gaukroger). This transformation in learning proceeded in even more radical and complicated ways over the next two centuries, producing a strong, all-knowing scientific culture claiming total knowledge, a commitment to which has become a fundamental feature of the modern era (the basic assumptions of this claim will be discussed later). The point here is not to discuss the emergence of scientific culture or how scientific values came to be regarded as the unique measures of all other forms of knowledge, but to elaborate on the idea of progress that accompanied it and the outcomes of this scientific culture today.

There is no doubt that the practical and intellectual aspects of science accomplished their major goal, indeed the goal of knowledge as identified by Francis Bacon centuries ago, of controlling and conquering nature. But when we look at the result of the relentless pursuit of control and ponder on the non-stop manipulation of nature today, we encounter not only the endangerment of various species of life, but a total life threatening prospect due to climate change and global warming. In 2001, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) confirmed that a global mean warming of 0.6 ± 0.2 ^{0}C had occurred over the course of the 20th century; but, scientists believe that this mean value conceals the complexity of observed climate change (Vaughan, 2001). As a widely distributed documentary, *An Inconvenient Truth* convincingly shows us that scientific-technological progress which has remained insensitive toward nature and ecology, since the Industrial Revolution is producing catastrophic environmental damages to the planet.

This new phenomenon, overshadowing notions such as country, geography, culture, science, and nation, concerns everybody; deals with all living things; and requires us to rethink and reconsider the aims of "development" and "progress" all over again to include and care for the ecological balance of the earth. In the first half of the 20th century, Walter Benjamin questioned the idea of progress and made cautionary remarks

2 Lat. *bonae litterae*: humane learning, by contrast with logic, metaphysics, and theology.

about its outcome that did not receive wide attention at the time. I should mention here the ideological context framing Benjamin's thoughts. As modern assumptions became more prevalent, they established beliefs that constitute the foundations of modern consciousness and the understanding of the world. The first of these is the belief in the concept of social progress, the idea that society and the individuals within it are gradually improving. The vision of social progress was closely tied to a belief in the growth of scientific knowledge and its necessary benefits for human beings. Thus, it is argued that the aim of growth is more growth, but what are the criteria for growth? And growth toward what? Walter Benjamin answers these questions by reflecting on a painting that he purchased from Paul Klee in 1921:

> A Klee painting named "Angelus Novus" shows an angel looking as though he is about to move away from something he is fixedly contemplating. His eyes are staring, his mouth is open, and his wings are spread. His face is turned toward the past. Where we perceive a chain of events, he sees one single catastrophe which keeps piling wreckage upon wreckage and hurls it in front of his feet. The angel would like to stay, awaken the dead, and make whole what has been smashed. But a storm is blowing from Paradise; it has got caught in his wings with such violence that the angel can no longer close them. This storm irresistibly propels him into the future to which his back is turned, while the pile of debris before him grows skyward. This storm is what we call progress (Benjamin, 1988, pp. 257-58).

Benjamin's and Klee's storm has turned into a threat today, jeopardizing the survival of all living organisms on earth. If the drastic ecological changes we are experiencing are prolonged, which may happen if serious measures are not taken to reverse the current trends, it would not be a prophecy to suggest that not only will the idea of "progress" be questioned, but also the technological outcomes that science produce will be disputed and contested as well. On a more positive note, it may well be that concepts such as "ecological ethics" will gain ground and cause us to increase our responsibility not only to our fellow human beings, but also toward all living things.

Experts who study climate change predict only adverse consequences for rising global temperatures. Cartesian thinking along with a hard positivistic mindset, which rejects the binding of particular value systems, a way of thinking that so strongly marks the modern period, in the midst of these predictions, sees alternatives; we will either allow humanity to

disappear along with all other living organisms or we will work together, hand-in-hand, to create new notions of "development" and "progress" that will foster the survival and betterment of human kind. This is a critical juncture and we all need to be concerned about the future of life and the earth. We must make decisions that no other generation in the history of humanity has ever been forced to make (Lipson, 2003, p. 27). Global warming, climate fluctuations, and their attendant calamities jeopardizing life in nature, as Slovaj Žižek puts, present us the "realities of our time." There is a "flow" before us that threatens the future of humanity recklessly and carelessly eradicating the particularities of all individuals and cultures (Žižek, 2003, p. 11).

As a matter of fact, Hasan Âli Yücel, a prominent philosopher of education in Turkey, thought that establishing equilibrium, between the material and physical powers and spiritual and moral values, is the most critical task of humanity in our time (Yücel, 1956, p. 7). This task is waiting to be accomplished in the context of world where millions of children die because of hunger, more than half a billion people suffer from malnutrition, and half of the world's population does not receive satisfactory health services. This is also a world where many developing countries are spending more money on armaments than they are on education and health services for their own people.

Peter Raven, a botanist and ecologist, argues that when rapidly growing economies ignore nature and ecology and omit human beings and their cultural needs from their organizations, they induce relentless and limitless habits of consumption. He questions, what kind and size of planet we need to sustain the market-driven cultures of consumption we see, especially in the developed world. He concludes from his research that "if everybody in the world lived in the way that the Americans live… we would have needed three more worlds to keep up this level of consumption" (Becker, 2004, pp. 82-83).

Let us now look at the concepts or mindsets that have significantly shaped the culture of thought and consciousness of modernity and consider the implications for the modern educational philosophy. As the Chinese proverb suggests "we make our houses and then we have to live in them." Modern consciousness, in other words, the modern house of being, to borrow from Heidegger, was shaped by the ideas of Descartes

(Watson, 2002: Touraine, 2007), Newton,[3] and Comte[4] over the last three centuries. The modern mindset is based on, in sum, the following three assumptions which have greatly influenced the general field of education and our understanding of what we can and cannot know as true and real (Sloan, 2003). The first assumption is what we call the "objectivistic" assumption of knowing, which derives from Cartesian split[5] between the subject and object, and which naturally ends with objectivist learning. This view supposes that the knower is simply a detached onlooker who understands the phenomena in nature or in the world as a mind-independent object, as though neither the knower nor the known were fundamentally interrelated and mutually affected in this process. On this assumption, if a person truly wants to know something, that person detaches himself or herself and concentrates efforts on perfecting the powers of description.

The second assumption is of an epistemological nature. This view assumes that we can only know what is given through our ordinary senses and through abstractions from sensory experience. Accordingly, invisible realities such as meaning, truth, and value may exist, but they are too small or too large to be perceived by our ordinary sensory apparatus. They are regarded, therefore, as simply unknowable. They may, indeed, exist, but they cannot be known. Some modern philosophical trends stop at this point but some others such as positivism go on further, arguing that if these invisible realities cannot be known, they are worthless and should not have any value in our lives at all.

The third assumption of modern thinking is a related metaphysical assumption about modernity. Here, reality is ultimately assumed as quantitative – without consciousness or life. It can only be understood in terms of physical cause-and-effect, through external relationships, for example, in a mechanistic way. In the 19th century, this quantitative-mechanistic view of knowable reality generated the so-called scientific and technological worldview which was then expanded to an all-

3 To acquire more information about the cultural meaning and foundation of scientific revolution in Newton's era, see (Jacob, 1988: Kearney, 1971).

4 Comte even tried to demonstrate how a new society can be designed based on sciences such as math and pyhsics (Comte, 1970).

5 To get more information about this split and its impact on education see (Descartes, 1943: 1986; La Mettrie, 1960; Ruhloff, 2001; Arslan, 2005). Some late modern philosophers, however, such as Wittgenstein and others move beyond this split and follow a different path (Wittgenstein, 1953).

encompassing picture of a dead, meaningless, and mechanical universe.[6] Whereas this view has been criticized since the beginning (think of Benjamin), it also continues to have a powerful impact in the making of modern consciousness (see Griffin, 1988).

As we debate the assumptions of modernity, questions arise: How do we evaluate the positive outcomes of a scientific-technological approach to knowledge? Have human beings made so little moral progress at all after all these techno-scientific advancements? Some leading thinkers in the humanities, for instance Jacques Ellul, argue that indeed, Western culture which is so heavily rooted to these modern assumptions has generated three positive outcomes: Technical reason, the rise of individuality, or the value of an individual, and the possibility of genuine freedom (Ellul, 1978). Anthony Giddens points out similar results of modernity, but, on the other hand, touches upon slightly different outcomes for modernity, arguing that its consequences do not necessarily lead us to postmodern era, but, quite the contrary; they would proceed and advance toward the peak of modernity through radicalizing and globalizing these consequences even further in depth (Giddens, 1990, pp. 163-173).

Although the critiques of modernity have intensified over the last several decades, as the spread and influence of postmodernist thinking suggests, modern assumptions continue to dominate modern consciousness and worldviews (Nozick, p. 630: Habermas, 1972). Whatever the criticism raised against the modern mindset and its basic assumptions, the fundamental parameters that constitute and shape modern life, as Hasan Ali Yücel affirmed, fail to satisfy the cravings for modern technology or the exciting discoveries of the positive, mechanical sciences (Yücel, 1956, p. 6). This sense of modernity's thrust despite its failings certainly stems from the captivating dynamism and vitality of modern science and technology. But, acquisitiveness and curiosity born of the technological dream is different from what we might see a deeper human yearnings.

To better understand the bind we are in, it is important, first, to re-examine the assumptions of the modern mindset. The positive potential stemming from this way of thinking appears to be rapidly disappearing,

---

6 Karl Polanyi calls this "great transformation" as people began to change their perceptions of the world and nature (Polanyi, 1944).

as leading thinkers of our time such as Jürgen Habermas, Alain Touraine, and Charles Taylor began to question.[7] The negative consequences of modernity's assumptions are now threatening to overtake their positive outcomes.

First of all, a purely quantitative, mechanistic way of knowing cannot deal with the most important dimensions of human experience (i.e. the entire realm of "quality" and what it is). These larger qualities include meaning, value, purpose, truth, beauty, goodness, and so on. An exclusively quantitative way of knowing cannot deal with the full scope of life and so cannot explain personal beings of any kind, except in their physical-mechanical aspects. This way of knowing reduces human being to bare material elements; hence, the moral and spiritual aspects of being human are totally excluded.

Because the modern dominant ways of knowing cannot deal with the qualitative and non-sensory realms, all of the concepts and realities having to do with these realms are regarded as not only unknowable, but also unreal. There are many ways of learning and knowing. The "knowledge" of a loving mother or a "devout" religious person is different from the "knowledge" of a cognitive psychologist, or a mathematician, but no less realistic or intelligent. In other words, positivist-scientific knowledge is limited in nature and scope and cannot speak as an ultimate authority on all human modalities of knowing. This does not only call for modesty on the part of the quantitative sciences; but also, suggests why science needs to be cognizant of the other ways of knowing and integrate its methods with the others stemming from these alternative ways of knowing.

Extended to the problem of education and modernity, religion, ethics, values, the arts, and meaning derived from personal and communal experience are on the defensive and are constantly forced to justify their places in educational programs. This can be observed within the university curriculum: Subjects having to do with the qualitative modes of knowing – religion, metaphysics, literature, poetry, and the arts – are constantly pressured to rationalize their existence in the curriculum. It is often remarked that the arts are always the first to be cut when budgets are tight – not biochemistry nor any other sciences.

---

7 There are number of studies that raise significant criticism against the hegemony of mechanical and technical reason and discuss its various consequences such as O. Spengler's *İnsan ve Teknik* (1976), M. Adas' *Machines as the Measure of Man* (1989), Lewis Mumford's *Makine Efsanesi* (1996) and his other works, Neil Postman's *Technopoly* (1993), J. Ellul's *Teknoloji toplumu* (2003), and so on.

Another consequence of our modern ways of knowing is the increasingly dangerous perpetuation of dualism in the modern world (i.e., the split between knowledge on the one hand and values, meaning, and faith on the other). A quantitative, sense-bound way of knowing has no place for intrinsic values and ethical ends since these are considered qualitative, arbitrary, and, therefore, irrational. Individuals or communities can assert their values only irrationally and dogmatically since they cannot be dealt with in connection with genuine knowledge. But, modernity thus faces a dilemma: As our modern ways of knowing wear away selfhood, community and nature, the values that they foster also crumble. As people cling to endangered values but can find no grounding for them in what is taken to be knowable reality and they are increasingly moved simply to assert them dogmatically, as Douglas Sloan argues, or, if the threat intensifies, either to give them up or to kill for them. Sloan argues further that we are witnessing the rise of two major phenomena of our modern world which only reinforce and feed off each other: The evaporation of all sense of truth and morality and the widespread of nationalistic, ethnocentric, and the religio-political-scientific fundamentalisms of every description.

This is perhaps the most serious consequence of the modern mindset that it is now threatening to undercut its own best potential, namely thinking based on technical reason, individuality, and genuine freedom. Thinking is losing its creative foundation and becoming increasingly fragmented or dogmatic. Individuality is losing its connection to a larger meaning and to other human beings and communities. It is becoming rugged and selfish and, ironically, disappearing into the collective. And freedom without qualitative direction and grounding simply vanishes.

The most important question today is how we can learn to live together in this "global village" if we cannot live together in the communities, cities, or regions to which we naturally belong. Do we want to make contributions to public life and can we do so? This is critical for democratic life, as the Delors Report suggests.[8] The will to participate and engage in the well-being of society needs to come from each person's inner sense of responsibility and freedom. There is no doubt that democracy has somehow managed to reach into new territories and lands where only totalitarianism and despotic rule have governed. Democracy

8 The report to UNESCO prepared by the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century.

in its contemporary forms, however, is showing signs of losing its vitality even in countries where democratic institutions have been rooted for centuries. It is as if there were a constant need for new beginnings toward a better future.

Since the basic framework of modern education is shaped by a mechanistic and positivistic worldview, it defines realities only quantitatively and this approach, as expected, creates mainly "mechanical-instrumental" ways of knowing and learning about social phenomena, the objects, and the universe. Yet, when we look at the things that make and raise the value of human beings and preserve and improve the value of human freedom, we find that they do not only consist of cognitive, mechanical dimensions of knowing, but also, more importantly, circumscribe deeper feelings and experiences such as "consciousness," "common sense," and "compassion." These dimensions of what it means to be human feed, and are fed in turn by, moral virtues and values. There are multiple ways of knowing but learning to be *human* is a critical aspect that is missing from modern education today.

Those who are educated only in the mechanistic, instrumental ways of knowing are denied a humanizing opportunity. When educate people to ignore fundamental experiences that preserve the value of being human such as "common sense," "compassion," and "empathy," they can inflict unimaginable harms on "others" as they are considered "lifeless," "unconscious" objects. Since the rising and driving modes of thoughts in many corners of the world are modern assumptions, it is possible to give several concrete examples from different regions and cultures that support this proposition. Humanity has achieved many breakthroughs and major advancements in science, medicine, even in the arts, as one of the legendary thinkers in economics, John K. Galbraith, affirms in his last work, *the Economics of Innocent Fraud.* Modern civilization has created wealth and improved conditions for masses of people, if not for everybody, but war, global conflict, and reckless manipulation of nature are now threatening the future of human existence, leading us to wonder whether the price of modernity is indeed too high (Galbraith, 2004)[9].

---

9 In addition, J. Carter discusses how crises in morality or lack of values can jeopardize not only the health but also the existence and longevity of any state and society (Carter, 2005). On the other hand, the earlier questioning of consequences of hard scientific mentality and reckless pursuit of industrialization by ignoring inculcating morality and values can be traced back to earlier leading, actually founding, ironically perhaps, modern philosophers such as Rousseau and Kant (Rousseau, 1943: Kant, 1960).

Richard Sennett, for example, convincingly argues that despite all these improvements in the material conditions of people, the steadily increasing sense of insecurity experienced by workers in many places is making it impossible for them to achieve a moral personality (Sennett, 1998).

If this is the situation we are in, Einstein's inspirational insight may show us the starting point: "The significant problems we face cannot be solved at the same level of thinking we were at when we created them." So, the first thing we need to do to solve the problem before us is to change the mentality and mindset that have created the problems that were identified earlier. To achieve this, it is first necessary to realize that learning and knowing do not only consist of mechanical[10] and instrumental ways of knowing and move beyond the Manichean dichotomy of fact and value, science and morality, religious experience and positive knowledge, and attempt to integrate them all. If this goal is achieved, then the integration of science, art and religion, which are the most important resources of human experience, can be more fully accomplished; furthermore, this integration would allow the domains of science, art, and religion to complete and enrich one another, instead of the one competing for domination over the others, in order to create the possibility of a more humane future. Otherwise, as one of the prominent politicians once said, unless we "reach deep inside to the values, the spirit, the soul, and the truth of human nature, none of the other things we seek to do will ever take us where we need to go" (Clinton, p. 4). The major issue discussed here is to indicate that injustices in the world, or missing values, as Kierkegaard persuasively calls, do not necessarily stem from the lack of knowledge or the availability of truth about such things, but rather the vanishing, "evaporation of the will." In fact, human beings have many ways and opportunities to know what is good and moral. They, however, cannot choose to act upon this knowledge when willpower fades (Habermas, 2003, p. 12).

It can be argued that we are living in a period of incomparable human circumstances. In the midst of global, political, and ecological developments, and new and vibrant change, where we are desperately in need of "will empowerment" that can realize virtue and morality, we must find ways to enable individuals to choose good, reversing the situation of which Kierkegaard spoke where values are internalized without sacrifice and are exhausted in the midst of conflicts of our own making.

---

10 See (Stiekel, 2005) where the author puts forward how this notion of mechanical way of knowing and defining the phenomena aptly questioned even by the leading contemporary scientists.

There is reason to take heart. Recent trends in educational thinking show that the modern educational theory is grappling with creating a more humane and comprehensive educational model, comfortable in an embrace of concepts such as "the environment," "the other," and "a sound future" in order to nourish a sense of responsibility not only toward our fellow human beings but also to all living organisms and nature. This has come only after the dawning realization that educating a person only in terms of a cognitive mind and not in terms of values and morals is to create new sources of threat and danger to society. As we witness the return of values education observed first in the 1970s through the studies of Kohlberg and others working in diverse cultural settings, value-centered educational perception is gaining ground both locally and internationally. There is no doubt that the quality and the power of human will determine the capacity and capability of this changing educational understanding.

References/Kaynakça

Adas, M. (1989). *Machines as the measure of men: Science, technology, and ideologies of Western dominance.* Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Arslan, A. (2005). *Felsefeye giriş.* Ankara: Adres Yayınları.

Becker, J. (2004). Çin'in büyüme sancısı: Daha fazla para, daha fazla nüfus ve daha fazla sorun. Peki ya çözüm? *National Geographic Türkiye*, *Mart* sayısı, 82-83.

Benjamin, W. (1988). *Illuminations* (derleme ve Giriş H. Arendt; çev. H. Zohn). New York: Schocken Books.

Benjamin, W. (2004). *Pasajlar* (çev. A. Cemal). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Carter, J. (2005). *Our endangered values: America's moral crises.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Clinton, B. (1993). *The text of the speech released by the White House Press Secretary*, November 13, Washington D.C.: White House.

Comte, A. (1970). Plan for the scientific operations necessary for reorganizing society. In Philip Rieff (ed.), *On intellectuals: Theoretical studies, case studies* (pp. 269-305). New York: Anchor Books.

Delors, J. (1996). *Learning: The treasure within: Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century.* Paris: UNESCO Publications.

Descartes, R. (1943). *Felsefenin ilkeleri* (çev. M. Karasan). Ankara: Maarif Vekâleti.

Descartes, R. (1986). *Aklını iyi kullanmak ve ilimlerde hakikatı aramak için metod üzerine konuşma* **(**çev. M. Karasan). Ankara: Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı.

Ellul, J. (1978). *The betrayal of the West* (trans. by M. J. O'connell). New York: Seabury Press.

Ellul, J. (2003). *Teknoloji toplumu* (çev. M. Ceylan). İstanbul: Bakış Yayınları.

Galbraith, J. K. (2004). *The economics of innocent fraud: Truth for our time.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity.* Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Gaukroger, S. (2006). *The Emergence of a Scientific Culture: Science and the Shaping of Modernity 1210-1685.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Griffin, D. R. (1988). *The reenchantment of science: Post modern proposals.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Habermas, J. (1972). *Knowledge and human interests* (trans. by J. J. Shapiro). Boston: Beacon Press.

Habermas, J. (2003). *İnsan doğasının geleceği* (çev. K. H. Ökten). İstanbul: Everest Yayınları.

Himmelfarb, G. (1996). The de-moralization of society: From victorian virtues to modern values. New York: Vintage Books.

Jackson, P. W., Boostroom, R. E., & Hansen, D. T. (1998). *Moral life of schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Jacob, M. C. (1988). *The cultural meaning of the scientific revolution*. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Kant, I. (1960). *Education* (trans. by A. Churton). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Pres.

Kearney, H. (1971). *Science and change 1500 – 1700.* New York: World History Library.

La Mettrie, J. O. de. (1960). *L'homme machine: A study in the origins of an idea.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Lehr, E. (t.y.). *Man or matter.* London: Faber and Faber Ltd.

Lickona, T. (1991). *Educating for character: How our schools can teach respect and responsibility.* New York: Bantam Books.

Lipson, L. (2003). *Uygarlığın ahlâki bunalımları: Manevi bir erimemi, yoksa ilerleme mi?* (çev. J. Ç. Yeşiltaş). İstanbul: İş Bankası Yayınları.

Mumford, L. (1996). *Makine efsanesi* (çev. F. Oruç). İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları.

Noam, G. G., & Wren, T. E. (1993). *Moral self: Building a better paradigm.* Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.

Nozick, R. (1981). *Philosophical Explanations*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknapp Press of Harvard University Press.

Polanyi, K. (1944). *The great transformation: The political and economic origins of our time.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Postman, N. (1996). *The end of education: Redefining the value of school*. New York: Vintage Books.

Postman, Neil. (1993). *Technopoly : The Surrender of Culture to Technology*. New York: Vintage Books.

Reuben, J. A. (1996). *The making of the modern university: Intellectual transformation and the marginalization of morality.* Chicago: University of Chicago Pres.

Rousseau, J. J. (1943). *İlimler ve sanatlar hakkında nutuk* (çev. S. Eyyüboğlu). Ankara: Marif Vekâleti.

Ruhloff, J. (2001). The problematic employment of reason in philosophy of *bildung* and education. In F. Heyting (Ed.), *Methods in the philosophy of education* (pp. 57-72). London: Routledge.

Schumacher, E. F. (1975). *Small is beautiful: A study of economics as if people mattered.* New York: Harper & Row.

Sennett, R. (2002). *Karakter Aşınması: Yeni Kapitalizmde İşin Kişilik Üzerindeki Etkileri* (çev. Barış Yıldırım). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Sloan, D. (2003). Openning the gates of knowledge. *Center for spiritual foundation of education.* Teachers College of Columbia University, New York. (Unpublished Paper/Basılmamış makale).

Spengler, O. (1976). *Man and technics: A contribution to a philosophy of life* (trans. by C. F. Atkinson). Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.

Smith, A. (1976). *The theory of moral sentiments.* Indianapolis: Liberty Classics.

Stiekel, B. (2005). *Çocuklar soruyor, Nobel'liler cevaplıyor* (çev. E. Günce). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları.

Touraine, A. (2007). *Bugünün dünyasını anlamak için yeni bir paradigma* (çev. O. Kunal). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Watson, R. (2002). *Cogito, ergo sum: The life of Rene Descartes.* Boston: David R. Godine.

Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *On certainty.* New York: Harper and Row.

Wynne, E. E., & Ryan, K. (1996). *Reclaiming our schools: Teaching character, academics and discipline.* New York: Prentice Hall.

Yücel, H. A. (1956). *İyi vatandaş iyi insan.* Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

Vaughan, D. G., Marshall, G. J., Connolley, W. M., King, J. C., Mulvaney, R. (2001). Climate Change: Devil in the Detail. *Science*. vol. 293 (September), pp. 1777-1779.

Žižek, S. (2003). *Gıdıklanan özne: Politik ontolojinin yok merkezi* (çev. Ş. Can). Ankara: Epos Yayınları.